

Subject: gas pipe line

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 12:07:52 EDT

From: <Tyndalltoni@aol.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

I wish to add my voice to the chorus of folks who do not want a pipe line brought through Connecticut and across the Long Island Sound. I believe the environmental damage is an insurmountable obstacle rendering this project wholly unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Tyndall
10 Vineyard Point Road
Guilford, CT 06437

Subject: Islander East Project Comments

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:30:31 -0400

From: Loretta Fox <73420.1625@compuserve.com>

To: "IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov" <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Sirs or Madams

My husband I want to provide our comments opposing the overrule by your department of the CT DEP objections to the Islander East's consistency certification. This project will clear cut land for the length of the project and clear cutting is strickly forbidden along rivers, streams and wetlands except in special farming issues...this is so stated in our state regulations. In addition, tidal wetland areas are very much impacted by this project. Precious shellfish and lobster habitats are greatly in danger from this project. The pressure of the need to pass through these protected leased beds has cause two shellfish companies to enter into large contracts for large \$\$\$ settlements - however, these precious bedding areas are in the public trust of CT and only leased by these farmers of the seabottom.....Also, upland water resources for drinking water and streams is treated by a known contaminated area which is within .1 mile of the proposed trenching and or blasting areas. This contaminated land area is well known to the CT DEP and on record as existing and uncleanable.....Please do not overturn our DEP/CZMA - Our DEP knows more about our State resources and their needs than you do. Protect our precious Long Island Sound...

Sincerely

Loretta And Bob Fox
15 Long Point Road
Stony Creek, CT 06405
203-488-8873

Subject: Stop Islander East

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Sun, 4 May 2003 07:42:50 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Lisa L." <lspeen@yahoo.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Please support the denial of federal consistency by our CT DEP. I have very serious concerns about the impact of the pipeline on the environment and the quality of life in Connecticut.

Sincerely,
Lisa LaSpina
23 Forest Street
Branford, CT 06405

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier. Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

Subject: pipeline
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Sun, 4 May 2003 12:07:29 -0400
From: "Donald Mac Donald" <donandpatmacd@worldnet.att.net>
To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Please support the denial of federal consistency by our CT DEP. I feel that the pipeline will destroy shellfish beds, jeopardize a large portion of our wetlands, and present a fire hazard to houses in our area.

Patricia MacDonald
74 Totoket Rd.
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Branford,CT

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:51:20 -0400

From: "Jerome Garrity" <jermilgarrity@earthlink.net>

To: "Islander East" <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

We were born and brought up in Branford. It is beyond belief that anyone,for any reason, would tear apart the ecology of this exceptional natural shoreline. My wife and I join in asking that the gas pipeline application be rejected. Jerome and Mildred Garrity 44 Castle Rock Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Islander East Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 07:05:22 -0700 (PDT)

From: Michael Lipp <lippym@yahoo.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed Islander East pipeline from Branford to Long Island. I have been a Branford resident for 24 years and I enjoy the town very much. Islander East should not be allowed to install this pipeline due to the environmental hazards it will create. Why should the state of CT and the residents of Branford have to suffer so that Islander East's management and executives may line their pockets with more gold? Is the energy and fuel situation a serious crisis on Long Island, and if so, why can't the pipeline be installed in New Haven? The proposed area for this pipeline is arguably one the prettiest areas of the CT shore. The Thimble Islands are a well-known beautiful treasure that risks being severely impacted for benefits that only residents of Long Island will experience. Please do not support this pipeline. Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion.

Mike Lipp
P.O. Box 426
Branford, CT 06405

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

Subject: Islander East Pipeline comments

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Tue, 06 May 2003 13:56:59 -0400

From: "Paul C. Huang" <p.huang@snet.net>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

CC: Jerry Shaw <jcs104@attbi.com>, kevin mullane <kevin.mullane@po.state.ct.us>,

KiKi Kennedy <KKennedyMD@aol.com>,

Loretta Fox <73420.1625@compuserve.com>,

William Horne <william.horne@yale.edu>,

Anstress Farwell <urbanedesignleague@iconn.net>,

Barbara Gordon <ctseafoodcouncil@aol.com>,

Douglas Herold <dherold@ctcentral.com>, "Dr. J Barclay" <JBarclay@canr.uconn.edu>,

"Rep. Pat Widlitz" <pwidlitz@snet.net>,

Senator Bill <William.A.Aniskovich@po.state.ct.us>,

Senator Williams <Williams@senatedems.state.ct.us>,

"stacy.ruwe" <stacy.ruwe@yale.edu>, Terence Elton <branfordecondev@yahoo.com>

As you well know, Islander East wants to build a pipeline that could supply enough gas to heat 1,150,000 homes on Long Island. Since there are about one million housing units (according to U.S. Census figures) on Long Island, this pipeline would instantly provide a 100% gas surplus because all the homes currently have heat.

So, what are Long Island's future energy needs that require a doubling of the existing gas supply? According to the long range Draft Energy Plan, Long Island will continue with its Clean Energy Initiative (CEI). The CEI targets energy efficiency, load management, and renewable energy resources. Please note that these programs have yielded over 122 GWh of energy savings so far, with 290 GWh of energy savings projected by the end of 2004.

The point is this: since Long Island is saving energy from its current energy budget, then why would the island need all that additional gas from the proposed Islander East Pipeline? The answer is Long Island doesn't need the pipeline. Here's why:

The Clean Energy Initiative also encourages the development and use of alternative and renewable energy technologies such as solar, wind, geothermal and fuel cells.

On August 31, 2002, Governor George E. Pataki joined with the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) and the Long Island Farm Bureau to formally dedicate LIPA's first land-based wind generator located on a working farm in Suffolk County. This will be the first of five to be erected by LIPA on farm sites in Suffolk.

On January 22, 2003, LIPA Issued a RFP for the Offshore Wind Generation Project. The Phase II Site Study shows south shore area near Jones Beach as optimal location for Long Island's First Wind Turbines. LI Environmental Groups support prospects for offshore wind generation's role in meeting the island's energy needs. (Please see LIPA's website for details.)

LIPA's offshore wind project would be a major cornerstone of Governor George Pataki's announced objective of achieving a 25 percent target for the state's electricity coming from renewable technologies within ten years.

January 16, 2002, Long Island's four newest power plants are now on line on the roofs of four BJ's Wholesale Clubs, where sun-powered electricity plants are now producing electricity. Thanks to a partnership between two Massachusetts-based companies – Conservation Services Group (CSG) and Evergreen Solar, Inc.

April 10, 2003—The Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) together with the Farmingdale State University of New York Solar Energy Center and the Institute for Sustainable Development of Long Island University today announced the Solar Long Island 2003 Conference. The conference, sponsored by the US Department of Energy (DOE), promotes the development and use of solar energy on Long Island as part of the Million Solar Roofs Initiative of the DOE.

February 5, 2003 – Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) Chairman Richard M. Kessel today announced the formation of a Task Force to investigate the potential for establishing an energy conservation rate for the Summer of 2004 that would reward LIPA customers for reducing electricity use during the peak demand months of June, July and August.

February 26, 2003, Plug Power Fuel Cell installed at McDonald's Restaurant, LIPA to install 45 more Fuel Cells across Long Island, including private homes.

Naturally, these new "high-tech" developments would compete directly with Islander East for the Long Island energy dollar. But, what's different between the new technologies and a pipeline is this: the new tech companies create new jobs and new industries. These are American companies, like Plug Power, Atlantic Orient Corporation, Conservation Services Group (CSG) and Evergreen Solar, Inc. If these companies are successful, then they could create thousands of new jobs.

And what would a small 50-mile pipeline company like Islander East LLC create? Aside from the initial construction period, this Company would employ a handful of people to manage and maintain this fixed asset with no new-job potential for the future.

Perhaps the most damaging aspect of the Islander East proposal is that the instant doubling of gas to Long Island would immediately drive down energy prices there. In effect, this is dumping cheap gas on that market. Islander East's dumping tactic would harm and hurt the new companies trying to deliver solar, wind and fuel cell energy to the public. A consumer would think twice about buying solar panels to heat her home if cheap gas were abundantly available. The proposed pipeline would damage the U.S. Department of Energy's policy to promote the development and use of solar energy.

Additionally, abundant, cheap gas would hurt local government incentives. Long Island launched its Solar Pioneer Program to encourage the use of clean solar energy among homeowners and to help make the installation more affordable. Direct incentives of \$5 per watt; a 25% State tax credit with a maximum credit of \$3,750; a 15-year real property tax exemption; and Net Metering that allows grid-connected solar systems to run electric meters backwards to offset a homeowner's normal utility bill.

In view of the high initial cost of solar panels, is it any wonder that Robert B. Catell, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of KeySpan Energy, was so anxious to build the pipeline. Here's what Mr. Catell wrote in his Annual Report dated March 12, 2002:

"Our gas business has a three-pronged strategy for achieving growth. The first part of the strategy focuses on increasing gas use by existing customers. While gas heating has always been our industry's mainstay, maximizing growth means emphasizing nontraditional uses. In Addition to heating, water heating, cooking and clothes drying, we aggressively promote gas grills, gas fireplaces, gas lights, pool heaters, and patio lighting. These uses add significantly to residential growth, providing almost twice the gross profit

margin of traditional uses.”

“One project in particular – the Islander East pipeline – is crucial for growing our gas business and maintaining reliable supply...The pipeline is expected to be completed in late 2003 and would initially deliver more than 260,000 dekatherms of gas daily, enough to heat 600,000 homes. At full capacity, Islander East would be capable of delivering 500,000 dekatherms daily.”

“The Islander East pipeline will optimize the assets KeySpan has in New York and New England.”

Mr. Catell wrote the above quote over a year ago. Meanwhile, on

February 13, 2003 – The Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) today announced the results of the audit it undertook of KeySpan Corporation’s misstatement of LIPA’s electric revenues for the years 2002, 2001 and earlier. The revenue misstatement was first announced by KeySpan last November. At that time, KeySpan Chairman Robert Catell took full responsibility for the error stating “KeySpan accepts responsibility for miscalculating the electric system requirements.”

Under several long-term contracts, KeySpan Corporation provides a range of services to LIPA for the management of the electric transmission and distribution system in Nassau and Suffolk counties, and the Far Rockaway peninsula in Queens. Such contracted services include the provision of financial and accounting data upon which LIPA relies for preparation of its financial statements.

LIPA’s external auditors have substantially completed the audit of KeySpan’s revenue misstatement, and identified the following:

? In 2002, KeySpan overstated LIPA revenues by \$62.6 Million;

? In 2001, KeySpan overstated LIPA revenues by \$11.6 Million;

It is clear that KeySpan's long-term service contracts with the LIPA create a conflict of interest between KeySpan's business goals and the general welfare of the energy consumer on Long Island. KeySpan knows exactly what every consumer uses and spends for energy because it's KeySpan's job to account for that usage. Thus, KeySpan can tailor its business plan, both long and short range, to suit its needs, and not the needs of the general public.

The fact that KeySpan overstated LIPA revenues by \$62.6 million dollars in 2002 means that the Long Island consumer used \$62.6 million dollars more energy than it actually did. Was this \$62.6 million a simple accounting error, or was it something else? (Remember Enron?)

I'd like to point out that in 2002 KeySpan and Islander East, LLC filed the necessary Applications for the proposed pipeline. In that Application, KeySpan/Islander East highlighted the recent dramatic increases in energy consumption on Long Island. The energy consumption data for 2001 and 2002 showed a combined increase of \$74.2 million dollars (\$11.6 million in 2001 plus \$62.6 million in 2002). Projecting this rate of increase over the next five years would give you the necessary numbers to show how badly Long Island needs the Islander East Pipeline.

Perhaps it might be wise to re-examine Islander East's Application in light of these accounting errors. Clearly, energy consumption on Long Island is not increasing as much as some people want us to believe.

In summary, LIPA's Clean Energy Initiative, the US Department of Energy and Governor George Pataki wants New York State to get 25% of its electricity from renewable technologies. This is not only good for New York, but also good for the Nation as a whole.

The Federal Government and its various Agencies should work in concert with State and local officials, rather than with any individual, self-serving company like Islander East, LLC. Therefore, the request by Islander East to build an unnecessary pipeline should be denied.

Sincerely,

Paul C. Huang
50 Island View Avenue
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Islander East Pipeline Project Denial

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Tue, 6 May 2003 14:21:53 -0400

From: "Dennis Kelly" <dks650@attbi.com>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Gentlemen,<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Subject: Islander East Pipeline Project Denial

Please support the denial of federal consistency by our CT DEP. The Islander East Pipeline Project unacceptably impacts our shellfish beds, water quality and wetlands with overall environmental destruction being long-term and severe.

This is a case of "the good of many people versus the profit of a very few." Your support of the denial of federal consistency will help protect the "good of the many" and our quality of life on the Connecticut shoreline.

Very truly yours,
Dennis and Marie Kelly
3 Howd Avenue
Branford, Ct.

Subject: Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Tue, 6 May 2003 16:03:09 -0400

From: "Jim McGuire" <jgm McGuire@snet.net>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project. Please deny their latest appeal and support our CT DEP.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

James G. McGuire
5 Seaview Ave.
Branford, CT. 06405

Subject: re appeal by Islander East Pipeline project

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Tue, 06 May 2003 17:12:37 -0400

From: Jay Pottenger <j.pottenger@yale.edu>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans

I am writing to express my very strong opposition to the proposed Islander East pipeline in Branford Connecticut, on the shoreline. The walk across the marsh is one of the most special places in Connecticut, not only is it a very beautiful and spiritual place, even beloved by the native peoples who have named so much of the surrounding area, but it is a very important eco system. Drilling in this area has got to cause enormous upheaval from which it may never recover.

I urge you to deny the appeal and support the CT DEP's determination that this is not consistent with CT's coastal zone management plan.

Thank you for your time and attention

Susan Wharfe
27 Thimble Farms Rd
Branford
CT 06405

Subject: RE: Islander East Pipeline Company
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Tue, 6 May 2003 18:05:09 EDT
From: <Daruten1@aol.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

(this area is where you can quickly personalize -- the idea is to give Commerce a sense of the uniqueness and beauty of the area through your eyes, through your activities, whether you walk the Nature walk or fish in Long Island Sound. You could write something like the following:

I have lived in Branford for many years. I enjoy walking the Nature Trail where the pipeline would go. The pipeline would degrade adjacent tidal wetlands where I like to look for Great Blue herons. These areas are beautiful, unique and rare. If degraded there is no adjacent land that could be used to make up for the loss. Please do not allow Islander East to destroy this beautiful area with its right-of-way.

or you could write about Long Island Sound or safety issues or whatever is/are the reason/s why you oppose Islander East.)

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Darlene and Jeremy Zimmermann
9 Anchorage Road
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Islander East Pipeline - "Stop the Pipeline"

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 07 May 2003 02:54:52 +0000

From: <SUNBUILDERS@att.net>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary of Commerce and General Counsel for Ocean Services; As a resident of Branford, Connecticut, and an active conservationist, I am writing to express my discontent with and total disapproval of the Islander East Pipeline Project. It is evident by the wealth of information available against the project, that it will be an environmenral disaster for the Thimble Islands and surrounding areas. In general it will have a negative environmental impact on the total ecostructure of the Long Island Sound. All for the megaprofits of a corporation that cares nothing about the environment that we inhabit, the water in our oceans, or the atmosphere that we breathe. A corporation that cares little about conservation or renewable energy programs, or the sustainability of our Mother Earth. Please take a stand and "Stop the Islander East Pipeline Project" for good. Please help us preserve the tidal marshes and ocean beds, and all of the life that they support, that will be carelessly and needlessly destroyed forever!!!

Respectfully yours

Edward J. Palma, SUNBUILDERS
Connecticut Home Improvement Contractor
Registration #561267
Connecticut Building Official License #ABO-027-90

Subject: Islander East

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Tue, 6 May 2003 20:52:08 -0700 (PDT)

From: Joanna Erikson <jme824@yahoo.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I moved to Branford just 5 years ago and have become aware of the fragility of the environment along the coastline. These areas are unique and rare. They must be preserved for future generations.

Long Island Sound is being assaulted from many sides-- overuse, over-development. This is a fragile ecosystem. I hope you will ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations.

Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Joanna Erikson
53 Quarry Dock Road
Branford, CT 06405

203-481-1450

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

Subject: Islander East pipeline proposal

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 06:47:41 -0400

From: "Kelly Brownell" <kelly.brownell@yale.edu>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

To: Secretary of Commerce

Dear Secretary,

I write regarding a proposal by Islander East to run a natural gas pipeline from Connecticut to Long Island, running through Branford, CT and the Thimble Islands. I live at 60 Island View Avenue in Branford and feel that the pipeline and its construction would have a very negative long-term impact on the area, its residents, and the environment. Therefore, I write to voice my strong opposition.

The pipeline would cut through our town in a most negative way, a town that has worked for decades to preserve its history and natural beauty. Pipeline accidents do happen, and were one to occur with this pipeline, the effects would be catastrophic. The pipeline would run very close to a school, would run directly through residential neighborhoods, and then would cross Long Island Sound where many years have been devoted to bringing the ocean back to life. Even without an accident, the environmental impact on the Sound from the construction alone would be severe. A government report on the environmental impact of the pipeline concluded that the proposed route of the line, through the Thimble Islands, would be illogical and ill advised. This pipeline would render the town vulnerable, countless residents vulnerable, and a delicate environment (Long Island Sound) vulnerable.

If one's object was to find the prettiest and perhaps most heavily used area on Connecticut's coast to put a pipeline, the Thimble Islands might be it. If it were to run through an industrial area and follow existing utility lines out into the Sound, maybe there would be some sense to the plan. The existing plan is not acceptable.

Thank you for supporting us on this.

Kelly Brownell

Kelly D. Brownell, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology, Epidemiology and Public Health

Director, Yale Center for Eating and Weight Disorders

Director of Graduate Studies

Department of Psychology, Yale University

2 Hillhouse Avenue, Box 208205

New Haven, CT 06520-8205

203-432-7790, 203-432-7788 (fax)

kelly.brownell@yale.edu

Subject: Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Wed, 07 May 2003 08:15:05 -0400
From: Kevin McGuire <kevinm@promocolor.com>
To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I am a Branford resident for the last 35 years and live in close proximity to the proposed pipeline and have been in strong opposition to it since Islander East first stepped on my doorstep. They wanted to start testing the soil on my property before I understood what they had proposed. I firmly denied and said "never".

A good portion of the area that will be effected by the pipeline was donated as open space by the good citizens of Branford upon there death. Islander East will destroy this and I find it a total slap in the face and a moral insult that they can take that from us. I have followed Islander East's public relations campaigns from running commercials on Long Island to drive up gas usage (heat the Hampton's swimming pools with clean efficient gas) on Long Island to their government lobbying efforts.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin J. McGuire
32 Wellsweep Rd.
Branford, CT
06405

Subject: Islander East pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 09:09:50 -0400

From: "CTsierraclub" <connecticut.chapter@sierraclub.org>

Organization: Connecticut Sierra Club

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project. I am currently the State Coordinator for the Connecticut Sierra Club. We have over 10,000 members in Connecticut. I have also worked in water quality on Connecticut rivers and harbors. There are many great people in this state working to make the state more beautiful and sustainable. This project will do neither.

Connecticut has the resources to make this state a leader in environmental and economic sustainability. This project is an example of the path well traveled. It's time to take a new path. Our economy and our environment (and therefore our lives) depend on it. Therefore, I ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,
John D. Calandrelli
CT Sierra Club
118 Oak St.
Hartford, CT 06106

Subject: Gas Pipeline Connecticut to New York

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 09:38:09 EDT

From: <RDonohoe@aol.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my complete opposition to the Islander East Pipeline Project and my support for its' denial by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection.

We have lived for over thirty years adjacent to a Tilcon railroad spur line which connects to the main Tilcon line which is the proposed site of the pipeline.

This entire area is heavily wooded. We have experienced train-wheel-spark-caused leaf fires on the rail line not 100 feet from our home. Hardly a suitable environment for a high-pressure gas pipeline.

What seems to be generally overlooked by the very few proponents and the very many opponents of the project is the position of the most affected entity, the Ticlon Company, on whose right of way the great portion of the project in this area would be located.

In a letter from their attorney, Stephen J. Anderson, to the Executive Director of the Connecticut Citing Council, dated April 5, 2002, the Tilcon Company states its' many objections to the proposed project, with the central theme being concern for safety issues. Given the horrible safety record of the pipeline industry as a whole in our country over the past several years, those concerns are not without merit.

The letter closes "In short, the pipeline and the railroad cannot safely co-exist on this narrow, single purpose piece of property! There are better, safer and less invasive options available to the applicant for its pipeline."

Amen to that.

Richard J. Donohoe
23 Tweed Road
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 13:32:13 EDT
From: <MZimmer679@aol.com>
To: Islandereast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans:

am writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

We are residents of 44 years in Stony Creek, Branford Connecticut. We have seen the magnificent cleanup of Long Island Sound so that oystering has been brought back as a major "Sound" industry. Because of the proximity of the route of the pipeline and the drilling and trenching necessary to place it, the enormous amount of sediment generated by this will have a disastrous effect on the shellfishing in the Sound. We have done a great job in making the Sound a much more benign environment in our lifetime. Let us not waste all that by putting in an unnecessary pipeline in place.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Marvin P. and Beverly Zimmerman
23 Prospect Hill Road
Stony Creek, Branford, CT 06405-5711

Subject: Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 13:35:55 -0400

From: Jerry Silbert <jsilbert@rwater.com>

To: "IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov" <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I have lived in Guilford, CT for 26 years. I enjoy walking the Nature Trail where the pipeline would go. The pipeline would degrade adjacent tidal wetlands. These areas are beautiful, unique and rare. If degraded there is no adjacent land that could be used to make up for the loss. Please do not allow Islander East to destroy this beautiful area with its right-of-way.

I know that energy issues are one of the most important challenges facing our society. However, reliance on petroleum based energy is a path to disaster. We must use the relatively short time left in petroleum and coal supplies to make the transition to energy sources that do not cause the greenhouse effect, are safe, and are renewable.

Future generations will be profoundly affected by the decisions we make in the next decade or two. Please take the soft energy path. Conservation, energy efficiency, and renewable sources of energy.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please ensure that our energy future is secure and in harmony with nature.

Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Jerry Silbert
155 White Birch Drive
Guilford, CT 06437

Subject:

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 15:01:46 -0400

From: "Nicholas Berkun" <nicvegan@att.net>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Secretary Evans:

Branford and surrounding communities are unique with heritage and New England Character not found anywhere else. The natural environment has already been severely impacted from industrial processes. However, there have been many positive actions to reverse the damage already caused. Any additional dredging, filling, blasting, or otherwise avoidable destruction caused by the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project is not in the best interest of this town, region, nor is it a national interest.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan. Furthermore, the expected impacts to the natural environment outweigh the benefits that may come from this project. Any unexpected losses resulting directly or indirectly from this project would add insult to injury.

Many people do enjoy walking the Nature Trail where the pipeline would go. The pipeline would degrade adjacent tidal wetlands where precious Osprey and Great Blue herons have returned to live. Due to congested nature of our shoreline there is no adjacent land that could be used to make up for the loss. Please do not allow Islander East to destroy any of our these beautiful areas with its right-of-way. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Nicholas Berkun

285 Branford Road

North Branford, CT 06471

Subject: Re.appeal by Islander East

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 15:13:10 EDT

From: <FVNNightHeron@aol.com>

To: IslanderEast.Comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans; I am writing you because of my strong opposition to the Islander east project. I ask that you deny the appeal by I.E. and support the C.T. DEP determination of inconsistency with coastal zone management plan.

I have lived and worked as an oysterman in Branford's Thimble Islands for 25 years, reviving an historical and economically important industry that will be impacted by this project. As you are no doubt aware, oystering, aquaculture, fishing, in general, is a dangerous and risky business, beset by pollution, environmental, and regulatory factors, not the least of which are big firms wanting to run their lines through our beds. Please do not let Islander East nail the lid on an activity that has been here for 150 years. The thimble Islands area is a unique spot encompassing thirty rocks and islands in a relatively unspoiled environment. The collateral damage from the installation of the pipeline could change that. I urge you to support Connecticut, and look at the alternatives.

Thank you Jonathan Waters

Subject: Branford, Connecticut Proposed Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 15:35:45 -0400

From: Donna.T.Gould@aventis.com

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

CC: KKennedyMD@aol.com, jgmcguire@snet.net, debbiemcquire@msn.com

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project. I am also writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East, and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I grew up in Branford and now visit frequently. My husband and I have been fortunate to travel to many areas of the world, but our favorite place continues to be the Nature Trail where the pipeline would go if approved. When in Branford we walk the trail daily. It is home to many varieties of tidal creatures and birds. In addition, it affords healthful exercise, and gives neighbors and residents an opportunity for meeting and greeting. All too often "progress" spoils areas that simply cannot be replaced, and destroys remaining wildlife habitats along with their native species. It is distressing to us that this request can be seriously considered. The tidal wetlands along this Trail are a true Connecticut asset.

The Nature Trail is not only enjoyed by Branford residents. I have talked with people from out of state who have visited the area to walk the Trail drawn by its increasingly rare beauty.

It is only through the foresight of persons in the past that this Trail exists at present. Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Donna Thompson Gould

Subject: Pipe Line

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 10:49:22 -0400

From: "Donald Mac Donald" <donandpatmacd@worldnet.att.net>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Along with many others I would like to voice my objection to this project. Not only does it propose a hazard to our shell fish beds, but also I believe that it is also a hazard to our community.

Islander East has stated that they would have a plane fly along the pipe line ONCE a week. There is no way that minimal protection like this will protect us from some terrorist group putting a hole in the pipe line and allowing the gas to fill the air. Any spark would set off a massive explosion.

Other pipelines in other parts of the country have exploded with out the assistance of terrorists.

Please turn down there request for this pipe line.

Don Mac Donald
74 Totoket Rd.
Branford, Ct.06405

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Subject: Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 11:13:11 -0400
From: <RGincavage@globalp.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

Islander East is trying to push this project through one of the most environmentally sensitive areas in Connecticut even though even FERC admits that there is a preferable route. Construction of this pipeline would destroy the beauty of land and habitat for many species of wildlife on land donated to the Branford Land trust by citizens to preserve this beauty and habitat. It is a betrayal of the trust these generous citizens placed in preserving the environment in this area.

Construction of the pipeline would damage valuable shell fish beds in the area as learned the hard way by the Iroquois project from Milford, Connecticut to Long Island many years ago. Many shell fish beds in this area still have not recovered.

Long Island Sound is a precious resource to Connecticut and I would like to see it preserved so that my child and her children can enjoy it as much as I have in my lifetime. The Sound does not purge itself as does the ocean so pollution created does not get flushed out of the area but gets moved back and forth as the tide flows in and out. This makes it a much more environmentally sensitive body than a more open body of water.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East. There is a very viable alternative that FERC agrees is less damaging to the environment.

Sincerely yours,

Ray Gincavage
11 Whiting Farm Road
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: islander east pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 12:43:31 EDT

From: <ROWMAN@aol.com>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

CC: KKennedyMD@aol.com

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander east and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I have only lived in Branford for 4 and a half years. I moved here for one reason alone, the ability for me to be near and on the water. Unfortunately I retired early due to an illness that prohibits me from working but not from enjoying the Thimble Islands and the fishing and the wonder of what God has created, and some days I feel that it was created just for me. I cannot express how wonderful it makes me feel to be here and enjoy this little part of heaven on earth. Please help me to continue to be able to enjoy the beauty of this special place. I am sure that there are many others that feel the same and do not want to be denied for themselves or their children and future generations the simple pleasures of Long Island Sound in all it's beauty.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected not only for now but for future generations as well. Please help us by denying this appeal by Islander east and keep our special place special.

Thank you for your time,

Peter J. DeBona

113 Flat Rock Rd.

Branford, Ct. 06405

203-483-0299

Subject: Islander East and National Security

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Thu, 08 May 2003 17:42:19 -0400

From: "Paul C. Huang" <p.huang@snet.net>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

CC: Anstress Farwell <urbandesignleague@iconn.net>,
Barbara Gordon <ctseafoodcouncil@aol.com>,
"Dr. J Barclay" <JBarclay@canr.uconn.edu>,
Jacquie Vierling-Huang <j.vierling-huang@snet.net>, Jerry Shaw <jcs104@attbi.com>,
kevin mullane <kevin.mullane@po.state.ct.us>,
KiKi Kennedy <KKennedyMD@aol.com>,
Loretta Fox <73420.1625@compuserve.com>, "Rep. Pat Widlitz" <pwidlitz@snet.net>,
Sandy Breslin <sbreslin@audubon.org>,
Senator Bill <William.A.Aniskovich@po.state.ct.us>,
Senator Williams <Williams@senatedems.state.ct.us>,
William Horne <william.horne@yale.edu>

Islander East, LLC. and National Security.

Years ago, Fairchild Aircraft, Grumman and the Sperry Rand Corporation produced military aircraft, guidance systems, avionics and bombsights on Long Island. Not anymore. Though Grumman is still there, it no longer makes fighter jets. So, even if Long Island lost all of its energy, the loss would not affect national security. Not one weapon system would be delayed due to a shortage of power.

Long Island has 2,753,913 residents, or roughly 1% of the US population. 1% is not "national." Further, Islander East was formed solely to build and operate a 50-mile pipeline. 50 miles of pipe is hardly of "national interest."

It is not necessary for a mighty nation like ours to hide behind the shield of "national security" on such a small issue as the Islander East Pipeline.

Long Island is currently well supplied with energy. In fact, according to LIPA's published 2003 budget, electric energy sales increased only 1.6% over the last year.

Since it is Governor Pataki's mandate to capture 25% of New York State's energy needs from clean, renewable energy sources over the next ten (10) years, then it would appear that an annual increase of 1.6% is well within the Governor's targeted number of 2.5% per year.

The point is that the projected growth in energy needs will easily be met by alternative sources.

These include: energy conservation and efficiency efforts, the installation of new technologies such as fuel cells, small wind turbines on farm property, large wind turbines off the South Shore of Long Island, solar power, and geothermal systems.

Clearly, the LIPA is planning to meet Long Island's future energy needs through research, innovation and alternative energy sources. An annual increase of 1.6% to 2.5% in energy usage is well within the reach of current technologies.

In fact, the use of the new technologies will help American industry and therefore significantly contribute to our national security. Imagine if Japan Inc. were to be the sole supplier of wind generators, fuel cells and solar panels. Would that be in our national interest and national

security?

Sincerely

Paul C. Huang
50 Island View Avenue
Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 11:39:33 -0400

From: "SMITH, Donna Rose" <DSMITH@audubon.org>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Re: Appeal by Islander East Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I have lived in Connecticut for many years. I enjoy walking the Nature Trail where the pipeline would go. The pipeline would degrade adjacent tidal wetlands where I like to look for birds. These areas are beautiful, unique and rare. If degraded there is no adjacent land that could be used to make up for the loss. Please do not allow Islander East to destroy this beautiful area with its right-of-way.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,
Donna Rose Smith
Woodbridge, CT

Subject: Islander East Negative Impact
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 12:27:57 -0400
From: "Ellen Rosenthal" <info@carolmarketing.com>
Organization: Carol Marketing Associates, Inc.
To: <islandereast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Secretary Evans,

This letter is being written to express my opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline.

Please deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the Connecticut DEP that this ill-conceived project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I live within 200 yards of the proposed pipeline path! I moved here five years ago because of the unspoiled beauty of the area – the salt marshes, the upland wooded areas and the beautiful shoreline. Our family enjoys the nature trails with their adjacent nesting areas of ospreys and blue herons.

We are both mad and saddened at the same time. Mad because there are less dangerous pipeline routes that could have been picked. Saddened because of the environmental damage that will occur to this beautiful coastal area. We are also appalled at the potential damage to the shellfish beds and the aquatic life of Long Island Sound.

Help us save this beautiful area for our children and all the generations that follow.

Sincerely yours,

Fred Rosenthal

10 Gaylea Drive

Branford, CT 06405

Subject: Islander East Pipeline Proposal for Connecticut
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 16:38:31 EDT
From: <Herbdoctor@aol.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov
CC: KKennedyMD@aol.com

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I have lived in Branford Connecticut for many years, on the shores of one of the country's unique and priceless sheltered saltwater areas. I have helped raised funds for the Branford Land Trust which helps acquire and protect the saltwater marshes, wetlands and uplands. These will be devastated by the proposed pipeline right of way. I have fished and clammed in off-shore waters that will be seriously harmed by this project.

Do not allow Islander East to impact seriously on these fragile, unique and beautiful land and coastal areas with its devastating right-of-way. These are environmental treasures which are the birthright of our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely, Herbert D. Lewis, M.D. 26 West Haycock Point Road Branford, CT

Subject: Request for Comments on Islander East Gas Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 23:04:51 -0400

From: "rbarba" <rbarba@snet.net>

To: <islandereast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Sirs:

I am a third family generation Branford resident for over 40 years. I grew up in the Stony Creek section of town and now live about a mile and a half from the proposed pipeline route. I work in and on Long Island Sound and also play there with my son. My occupation has taken me all over the country and I have seen, worked on and installed underwater pipelines and cables. I have never seen any permanent damage to the environment in any cases. My experience with horizontal drilling underwater has shown no harmful effect to marine life with the drilling mud such as bentonite. In fact the last project I was on involved a major spill of drilling mud and we found that Blue Crabs and bottom feeding fish flourished in the spilled bentonite. As for jetting operations again I feel this would also have a minimal impact on marine life. It is my opinion that fishing draggers in Long Island Sound would have a greater impact than a jetting operation for a pipeline or cable crossing. Inclosing I am for the pipeline in Long Island Sound.

Very truly,
Robert K. Barba
P.O. Box 302
Branford, CT 06405
rbarba@snet.net

Subject: Reject the Harmful Islander East Pipeline Appeal

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Mon, 12 May 2003 09:34:56 -0400

From: "Jon Wilson" <jonwilson@snet.net>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

CC: "Senator Lieberman" <senator_lieberman@lieberman.senate.gov>,
"Senator Christopher J. Dodd" <Senator_Christopher_J._Dodd@dodd.senate.gov>

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project. This pipeline is clearly an abuse of eminent domain.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

The existing environmental protection laws should not be corrupted to provide compensation for political contributions by the energy industry. In addition, Building a natural gas pipeline next to a school should, in my opinion, be a criminal offense.

Please ensure that Connecticut's coast and the waters of Long Island Sound are preserved and protected for future generations. Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours,

Jon Wilson
9 Bowhay Hill Road, Stony Creek, CT. 06405

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Pipeline
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 21:17:37 EDT
From: <Mollyvisnic@aol.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Secretary Evans:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Islander East Pipeline Project.

I am writing to ask that you deny the appeal by Islander East and support the determination by the CT DEP that this project is not consistent with Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Plan.

I have lived in Branford for 5 years. We moved here to raise our family by the water.

We swim in the water, we fish in the water, we eat the lobsters and clams along this shoreline. Since living here there have been numerous accidents with the Tilcon Barge along the shoreline. One accident within the past 6 months. The damage was minimal and immediately cleaned....if a gas pipeline was put on this dangerous property it would have ended much differently. It is unsafe to put a gas pipeline next to a train full of boulders and barges full of boulders. Please do not let Islander East destroy CT's shoreline.

Thank you for your time.

Please deny the appeal by Islander East.

Sincerely yours.

Mary Margaret Visnic
347 Pine Orchard Road
Branford, CT 06405